



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,263	09/30/2000	Xia Kevin Dai	042390.P9724	2093

7590 04/09/2003

John Patrick Ward
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

YANCHUS III, PAUL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2185

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/677,263

Applicant(s)

DAI, XIA KEVIN

Examiner

Paul B Yanchus

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the sleep state" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19,20, 31-32 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noble et al., US Patent no. 5,760,636.

As per claims, 1-7, 9-10 and 31-32, Noble et al. teaches a system comprising:

a component [column 8, lines 20-40];

a detector to detect a power management event [column 8, lines 20-40]; and

a controller to transition a first setting of the component from a first performance mode to a second performance mode [column 8, lines 40-55],

the controller to change a second setting of the component from a first performance mode to a second performance mode [column 8, lines 40-55].

Noble et al. teaches transitioning a level of voltage supplied to a processor from a low power state to a normal power state, in response to detection of a desire to change a computer system in low power mode to normal power mode. After voltage to the processor is increased, the core clock frequency of the processor is increased from a low frequency level to a higher frequency level.

As per claims, 11-17, 19-20 and 34-35, Noble et al. teaches a system comprising:

a component [column 7, lines 55-60];

a detector to detect a power management event [column 7, lines 55-60]; and

a controller to transition a first setting of the component from a first performance mode to a second performance mode [column 8, lines 5-10],

the controller to change a second setting of the component from a first performance mode to a second performance mode [column 8, lines 10-20].

Noble et al. teaches transitioning a core clock frequency of a processor from a normal frequency state to a lower frequency state, in response to detection of a desire to change a computer system in normal power mode to low power mode. After core clock frequency of the processor is decreased, voltage supplied to the processor is decreased from a normal level to a lower level.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 18, 21-30, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noble et al., US Patent no. 5,760,636, in view of Pole, II et al., US Patent no. 6,311,281.

As per claims 8, 18, 33 and 36, Noble teaches a system, as described above, but does not explicitly teach detecting a power management event that includes a change of power source between an internal power source and an external power source. In summary, Noble et al. does not teach changing the operating state of a processor based on the type of power source supplying power to the system.

Art Unit: 2185

Pole, II et al. teaches changing the operating state of a processor based on the type of power source supplying power to the system. Pole, II et al. teaches operating a processor in a high performance state when a large amount of power is available to the processor and operating the processor in a lower performance mode when a lesser amount of power is available to the processor [column 2, lines 25-35].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Noble et al. and Pole, II et al. Changing the operating modes of a processor based on the power supplied to a system enables a mobile computer system to save power when power is the greatest concern or operate faster when performance is the greatest concern [column 2, lines 25-35].

As per claims, 21-30, Noble et al. and Pole, II et al. teach a system comprising a processor which changes operating states based on power management events, as described above. Therefore, Noble et al. and Pole, II et al. also teach a computer readable medium, which causes a processor to change operating states based on power management events.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul B Yanchus whose telephone number is (703) 305-8022. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-5:30 (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2185

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-9183 for regular communications and (703) 746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Paul Yanchus
April 4, 2003



THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100